

Applicant : Miller et al.
Serial No. : 10/633,276
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 7 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 05542-528001 / 008252/CMP

REMARKS

Claims 1-53 were pending. The applicant canceled claims 23-53, which were withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement. The applicant amended claims 1, 12, 13, and 19. Claims 1-22 are pending, of which 1 and 12 are independent. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 13, 16, and 19 are objected to as being allegedly informal. The applicant amended claim 13 as required by the Examiner. The applicant amended claim 19 to correct the misspelling of the term "platen" and for clarification and respectfully notes that the amendment to claim 12 provides antecedent basis for the terms "one or more protrusions," which are recited in claim 19.

The applicant respectfully traverses the objection to claim 16. The Examiner contends that the phrase "the group consisting of a MnZn ferrite material and a NiZn ferrite material" lacks antecedent basis. The applicant respectfully submits that such a phrase is expressly allowed for reciting a Markush group. *See, e.g.,* MPEP Section 2173.05 (h)1.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077031 to Johansson et al. ("Johansson"). The applicant amended claim 1, which now recites "an elongated core . . . , the elongated core including one or more protrusions and having a length and a width, the length being parallel to the polishing surface and longer than the width, at least one of the one or more protrusions having a same extent as the length." The length of the core cannot be construed to be from top to bottom of the core depicted in FIG. 6 of Johansson because such a length is perpendicular rather than parallel to the polishing surface, as required by claim 1. If length is construed to be from left to right of the core depicted in FIG. 6, then none of the protrusions in Johansson would have a same extent as the length of the core, as required by claim 1. If length is construed to be from front to back of the core depicted in FIG. 6, then the length of the core would not be greater than

Applicant : Miller et al.
Serial No. : 10/633,276
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 8 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 05542-528001 / 008252/CMP

the width of the core, as required by claim 1. For at least the above reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowed.

The applicant amended claim 12, which now recites "an elongated core including a back portion and one or more protrusions extending away from the back portion along a first axis, the elongated core having a length and a width, the length being orthogonal to the first axis and longer than the width, at least one of the one or more protrusions having a same extent as the length." The length of the core cannot be construed to be from top to bottom of the core depicted in FIG. 6 of Johansson because such a length is parallel rather than orthogonal to the first axis, as required by claim 12. If length is construed to be from left to right of the core depicted in FIG. 6, then none of the protrusions in Johansson would have a same extent as the length of the core, as required by claim 12. If length is construed to be from front to back of the core depicted in FIG. 6, then the length of the core would not be greater than the width of the core, as required by claim 12. For at least the above reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 and its dependent claims should be allowed.

Section 103 Rejections

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johansson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,142,228 to Kingsbury.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johansson in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,608,860 to Ramey.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johansson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,057,684 to Murakami et al. ("Murakami").

Claim 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johansson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,232,775 to Naitoh.

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johansson in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0150500 to Kiko ("Kiko").

Claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johansson in view of Kiko and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0047705 to Tada et al. ("Tada").

Applicant : Miller et al.
Serial No. : 10/633,276
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 9 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 05542-528001 / 008252/CMP

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johansson in view of Kiko and Tada, and in further view of Murakami.

Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17-22 depend from either claim 1 or claim 12. For at least the reasons set forth above, the applicant respectfully submits that these claims should be allowed.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 12-15 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-10 of co-pending U.S. Application Serial No. 10/124,507 to Birang et al. ("Birang") in view of Johansson.

Claim 5 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-10 of Birang in view of Johansson and in further view of Ramey.

Claims 10 and 11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-10 of Birang in view of Johansson and in further view of Murakami.

Claims 17 and 18 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-10 of Birang in view of Johansson and in further view of Kiko.

Claims 19-21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-10 of Birang in view of Johansson and in further view of Tada.

Claim 22 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-10 of Birang in view of Johansson and Kiko in further view of Murakami.

The applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above, the amendments to claims 1 and 12 obviate the double patenting rejections. In particular, the Examiner recognizes that claims 8-10 of Birang do not disclose or suggest the claimed elongated core. The applicant respectfully submits that, as set forth above, neither does Johansson. Hence,

Applicant : Miller et al.
Serial No. : 10/633,276
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 10 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 05542-528001 / 008252/CMP

the claims of the present applicant are not obvious in view of claims 8-10 of Birang in view of Johansson.

New Claims

The applicant added new claims 54-59. Support for these claims can be found in the specification at least at FIGs. 10A and 10B and the corresponding text.

Claims 54-57 depend from either claim 1 or claim 12 and should be allowed for at least the reasons that claim 1 or claim 12 are allowable.

Claim 58 recites an "elongated core having a plurality of prongs extending in parallel along a first axis parallel to the top surface and spaced apart from each other along a second axis parallel to the top surface and perpendicular to the first axis, the core having a length along the first axis and a width along the second axis, the length being longer than the width." For reasons similar to those set forth above, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 58 and claim 59, which depend from claim 58, should be allowed.

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Applicant : Miller et al.
Serial No. : 10/633,276
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 05542-528001 / 008252/CMP

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed. Please apply \$120 for a one-month extension of time and any other appropriate charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Dec. 27, 2005



Tim H. Pham
Reg. No. 48,589

Customer No. 26185
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50298866.doc